



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/641,031

08/16/2000

Arvind A. Raichur

30874-UT

3761

5179

7590

07/27/2006

PEACOCK MYERS, P.C.

201 THIRD STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1340

ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87102

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/641,031

Applicant(s)

RAICHUR ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment: filed 07/26/2005, with acknowledgement of original filed 08/09/2000.
2. Claims 1-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 5-9, 13-17, and 21-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobson et al (hereinafter "Jacobson"), US 5,970,489 filed 5/20/1997 inview of Fields et al. (hereinafter "Fields"), US 6,338,059 131 12/17/1998.

Regarding independent claims 1, 9, and 17, Jacobson teaches providing an index server maintaining a permanent but dynamic index to hypertext transmission protocol pages and employing a hierarchical plurality of topic categories whose contents are maintained and updated by the index server in fig. 1, col. 1 lines 52-63, and col. 2 line 33 - col. 3 line 50. Jacobson teaches permitting a user to specify any subset of the plurality of topic categories in fig. 1, 2, col. 3 line 1 - col. 5 line 15. Jacobson teaches a user controlling information permitting execution of searches of the index server in any category of the subset but only categories of the subset in fig. 3, col. 5 lines 16-46, and col. 8 line 3 - col. 11 line 26.

Jacobson does not teach adding the search information into a link that can be incorporated into a hypertext transmission protocol page. Fields does teach adding search information into a link that can be incorporated into a hypertext transmission protocol page in col. 1 line 65 - col. 2 line 17 and col. 3 lines 5-22.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Jacobson and Fields to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have implemented the user-definable region-set focused, keyword searching of Jacobson into a hyperlink as taught by Fields to have facilitated a user's search of an index as taught by Fields in col. 2 line 1-6 and col. 5 lines 26-33 and as taught by Jacobson in col. 1 lines 43-49 and col. 11 lines 19-27.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 13, and 21, Jacobson teaches allowing the user to rename one or more categories of the subset, as it will appear on the hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user in fig. 1, 2, and col. 3 line 1 - col. 5 line 15.

Regarding dependent claims 6, 14, and 22, Jacobson teaches allowing the user to rearrange hierarchicalization of one or more categories of the subset as it will appear on the hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user in fig. 1, 2, and col. 3 line 1 - col. 5 line 15.

Regarding dependent claims 7, 15, and 23, Jacobson teaches permitting the user within a branch of a hierarchy of categories to either include or exclude subcategories in the branch or both in fig. 1, 2, and col. 3 line 1 - col. 5 line 15.

Regarding dependent claims 8, 16, and 24, Jacobson teaches wherein the user may specify any subset of the plurality of topic categories by the user at any time, whereby the

information is dynamically updated to correspond to the new subset in fig. 1, 2, and col. 3 line 1 - col. 5 line 15.

5. **Claims 2-4, 10-12, and 18-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobson et al (hereinafter "Jacobson"), US 5,970,489 filed 5/20/1997 in view of Fields et al. (hereinafter "Fields"), US 6,338,059 131 12/17/1998 as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and further in view of Kelley et al. (hereinafter "Kelley"), US 6,209,007 B1 filed 11/26/1997.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 10, and 18, Jacob teaches permitting a user to search and adjust one or more categories of the subset of pages maintained by the index server in fig. 1, col. 1 lines 52-63, and col. 2 line 33 - col. 3 line 50. Jacobson does not teach permitting the user to propose addition of a hypertext transmission protocol page to the index server in conjunction with one or more categories of the subset and automatically adding the proposed page to the index server wherein the user can search the proposed page via the link information and wherein initially other users will not search the proposed page even if searching the proposed one or more categories.

Kelley teaches permitting a user to propose addition of hypertext transmission protocol page to an index server and automatically adding the proposed page to the index server wherein the user can search the proposed page via the link information and wherein initially other users will not search the proposed page in fig. 10, col. 4 lines 19-23, and col. 9 lines 22-24.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Jacobson, Fields, and Kelley to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the user URL index customization as taught by Kelley to have improved Jacobson and Fields so that the search index could have been customized as taught by Kelley in col. 4 line 19-23 and col. 9 lines 22-24.

Regarding dependent claims 3, 11, and 19, Jacob teaches permitting a user to search and adjust one or more categories of the subset of pages maintained by the index server in fig. 1, col. 1 lines 52-63, and col. 2 line 33 - col. 3 line 50. Jacobson does not teach verifying that a uniform resource locator address for the proposed page is valid and that the proposed page is not already indexed under the proposed one or more categories. Kelley teaches verifying that a uniform resource locator address for the proposed page is valid and that the proposed page is not already indexed under the proposed one or more categories in fig. 10, col. 4 lines 19-23, and col. 9 lines 22-24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Jacobson, Fields, and Kelley to have created the claimed invention.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the user URL index customization as taught by Kelley to have improved Jacobson and Fields so that the search index could have been customized as taught by Kelley in col. 4 line 19-23 and col. 9 lines 22-24.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 12, and 24, Jacob teaches permitting a user to search and adjust one or more categories of the subset of pages maintained by the index server in fig. 1, col. 1 lines 52-63, and col. 2 line 33 - col. 3 line 50. Jacobson does not teach subsequently allowing other users to search the proposed page when searching one or more of the proposed one or more categories. Kelley teaches subsequently allowing other users to search the proposed page when searching one or more of the proposed one or more categories in fig. 10, col. 4 lines 19-23, and col. 9 lines 22-24.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Jacobson, Fields, and Kelley to have created the

claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the user URL index customization as taught by Kelley to have unproved Jacobson and Fields so that the search index could have been customized as taught by Kelley in col. 4 line 19-23 and col. 9 lines 22-24.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 05/10/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reason is set forth in the current Office Action cited above and further view of the following:

Brief description of cited prior arts:

Jacobson discloses method of searching for documents on the World Wide Web, wherein a region in the web defines a space for a group of related documents, by providing topic-based hierarchical directories that allow users to navigate the topic/sub-topic hierarchy and pose keyword-based queries to locate documents classified under any specific topic of interest (see Jacobson co. 11, lines 35-40, col. 1, lines 25-35).

Fields discloses a method for adding information into an element (i.e. link) of a new or existing webpage (i.e. a hypertext transmission protocol page - see Fields at page col. 1, lines 65-67 also see Fig. 1A-4).

Kelly providing individual customization to include only the subset of data that a particular user finds of interest and still retain the basic structure of the web page from the original document a customized web page containing information from other web pages

accessible by a client computer from an inter- or intra-net (i.e. allows user to add addition to a web page (i.e. a hypertext transmission protocol page) - see Kelly at col. 1, lines 20-25).

Response to Arguments:

Beginning on page 2 of the Remarks (hereinafter the remarks), Applicant argues the following issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

Applicant's arguments, on pages 2-3 of the remarks that the references in combination, do not teach, particularly the Jacobson reference:

- (i) "Index server",
- (ii) "Hierarchical plurality of topic categories"

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As for (i) and (ii), The examiner respectfully notes that, Jacobson discloses method of searching for documents on the World Wide Web, wherein a region in the web defines a space for a group of related documents, by providing topic-based hierarchical directories that allow users to navigate the topic/sub-topic hierarchy and pose keyword-based queries to locate documents classified under any specific topic of interest (see Jacobson co. 11, lines 35-40, col. 1, lines 25-35).

It is noted that Jacobson's method of improves a search in hierarchical structures, provides topic-based hierarchical directories that allow users to navigate the topic/sub-topic hierarchy and pose keyword-based queries to locate documents classified under any specific topic of interest, since the web server provides a group of related documents, as topic-based hierarchical directories (i.e. index) that allow users to navigate the topic/sub-topic hierarchy

Art Unit: 2176

wherein the documents classified under any specific topic of interest, can reasonably interpret as

(i) "*Index server*" (ii) "*Hierarchical plurality of topic categories*" of the claimed invention.

For further support to the above rejection, the examiner respectfully notes that, the Kelly reference provides a parameter for a search of design information from web pages on a network by user interacting with the work server wherein individual customization to include only the subset of data that a particular user finds of interest and still retain the basic structure of the web page from the original document a customized web page containing information from other web pages accessible by a client computer from an inter- or intra-net (i.e. allows user to add addition to a web page (i.e. a hypertext transmission protocol page) - see Kelly at col. 1, lines 20-25) also see Fig. 9-10 steps 700-880).

Thus the Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of independent claims 1, 9, 17 and their dependencies for at least the reason cited above at this time.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2176

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272- 4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
July 21, 2006

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER